## Web extra Quality assessment of studies using criteria adapted from Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale

Study Country	Participant selection  * ≥ 80% eligible patients invited and agreed to participate OR sample size ≥ 300. PR=participation rate	Measurement of emotional distress (assessment time) * = Used reliable and valid tool <sup>†</sup> M=means SD=standard deviation	Comparability on confounders  ** = P & NP equivalent on age (A), previous ART (E), parity (P) and duration of infertility (D); * = Equivalent on at least two confounders and not unequal on others	Outcome & follow-up  * = > 80% completion rate (agreed/analysed, CR) for treated patients <sup>††</sup> PT=Pregnancy test Scan=foetal scan at six weeks	Total quality rating low (0 to 2 stars), average (3 stars) or high (4 to 5 stars).
Akyuz 2006 Turkey [abstract]	Patients attending clinic, unexplained infertility, ICSI only, all had ET, PR= Authors report that all 80 invited agreed	*STAI state, beginning of IVF; M/SD at conference	P	*Positive PT, author reports 100% (80/80) CR	Low
Anderheim 2005 Sweden	*All patients attending pre-IVF information session, PR=83.0% (166/200)	PGWB – Anxiety, one month before onset of down-regulation	A, P, D and smoking status but NP > P on E	*Positive scan, author reports CR=100% (139/139), denominator excludes 27 no ET)	Low
Boivin 1995 Canada	Patients referred by doctors, first-time IVF only, PR=71.4% (50/70)	*STAI State, 1.83 months before IVF (email)	**A, P, D, E, and years in treatment, diagnosis	* Positive PT, CR=80% (40/50), denominator excludes 13 not started and 7 no ET	High
Demyttenaere 1992 Belgium	First 80 consecutive patients, attending for IVF, PR=50% (40/80)	*ZDI, Day 4-5 follicular	No evidence reported	* Positive PT, CR=100% (40/40)	Low
Demyttenaere 1998 Belgium	Referred to study by doctor, primary infertility, IVF, PR=78.4% (98/125)	*ZDI, Day 3 follicular	**A, P, D, E	* Positive scan, CR=100% (125/125)	High
Ebbesen 2009 Denmark	*Consecutive admissions, first cycle of IVF PR=53.0%, 837/1578	*BDI II; returned before first follicle scan	*Author reports controlling for A, D and diagnosis. All first time IVF (E).	* Positive scan, CR=96.7%, 809/837	High
de Klerk 2008 Netherlands	*All couples attending IVF planning consultation and suitable and having a single embryo transfer (SET), excluding those with previous unsuccessful IVF cycle, PR=not reported, 391 agreed	*HADS – Anxiety, six weeks before IVF/ICSI	*Author reports that A, D not significant predictors of outcome status	Live birth, CR=77.9% (289/371), denominator excludes 10 not started & 10 pregnant waitlist	Average
Klonoff-Cohen 2001 United States	Patients accepted for IVF/GIFT in 7 clinics excluded those with pre-existing illness, PR=not reported because eligible not known, N=151 participated	*POMS- Anxiety, prior to first visit and start of IVF M & SD by email	*Author reports odds ratio adjusted for A, P, E and race, education, type of ART, ever smoked	*Live birth, CR=90.1% (136/151)	Average
Lancastle 2008 UK	*All patients attending initial consultation for IVF, PR=90.8% (129/142)	*STAI state, 2.84 months before IVF (Means & SD by email)	*A, D, E (email)	Positive PT, CR=76.8% (76/99), denominator excludes 30 no ET (email)	Average

As submitted by author

Web extra BMJ 2011;342:d223

Lee 2006 United	*Patients undergoing fresh IVF cycle, PR not	*CES-D, Day 3 follicular	D	Positive scan, CR=not	Low
States	reported, N=804 participated			reported but 804	
		Means & SD by email	(email)	analysed	
[abstract]					
				(email)	
Lintsen 2009	*All new couples with an indication for IVF/ICSI	*STAI state	*A, D, E and primary	* Positive scan,	High
Netherlands	in 11 clinics and 3 hospitals, first-time ART only,	1 to 2 months pre	infertility and diagnosis	CR=97.8% (690/705),	
	PR=69.7% (783/1124)			denominator excludes 78 no ET	
Merari 2002 Israel	Patients attending for IVF, with primary and tubal/	*STAI state, 10 to 15 days before IVF	**A, P, D, E	* Positive scan, CR=89.7%	High
	unexplained infertility, PR=93.3% (126/135)	Means & SD (email)		(113/126), denominator	
		Wicans & 3D (chian)	(Merari 1992 and email)	excludes 10 did not start	
			(Wichair 1992 and chiair)	and 3 pregnant waitlist	
Sanders 1999	New patients attending for IVF/GIFT, 101 agreed,	*STAI state, 1 to 3 months	No evidence reported	* Positive scan, 93.8%	Low
Australia	authors report PR=45.7%	before ART	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(90/96), denominator	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			excludes 5 did not start)	
		Means & SD (email)		Í	
Verhaak 2001	*Consecutive patients attending for IVF/ICSI,	*STAI, 3 to 10 days before	*A, P, D	* Positive scan, 100%	High
Netherlands	PR=82.8% (207/250)	IVF		207/207)	
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		<del></del>	

**Note:** P=pregnant and NP= not pregnant. SET criteria were age < 38 years, regular cycle, normal BMI. †Standardised questionnaire based on previous meta-analysis Hammerli et al. 2009 and Bowling et al.. ††Not all patients get treated due to being pregnant on waitlist or deciding against ART. BDI = Beck Depression Inventory; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory Primary Care (PC); CES-D = Centre for Epidemiologic Studies; HADS= Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale anxiety; PGWB = Psychological General Well-Being; POMS = Profile of Moods Scale [unipolar] anxiety or bipolar depression; ZDI = Zung Depression Inventory. *Selection* was met when ≥ 80% eligible were invited and ≥ 80% agreed to participate or when sample size > 300 (\*). *Comparability* was met when studies showed evidence that at study entry Pregnant and non-Pregnant groups were equivalent on age, ART experience, parity and duration of infertility (\*\*) or when there was equivalence on any two without inequality on others (\*). *Measurement quality* was met when reliable and valid methods were used to assess anxiety or depression (\*). *Quality of outcome and follow-up* was met when the completion rate (agreed to participate/analysed) for those doing ART study was > 80% (\*). The overall *quality rating* was low (0 to 2 stars), average (3 stars) or high (4 to 5 stars).

As submitted by author Web extra BMJ 2011;342:d223